UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

Steven Robert Evan God,

Case No. 2:25-cv-00025-RFB-BNW

Plaintiff,

SCREENING ORDER AND REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

v.

Steven R. Evans God,

Defendant.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Presently before the court is pro se Plaintiff's complaint (ECF No. 1-1) and application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1).

I. In forma pauperis application

Plaintiff submitted an incomplete and unintelligible declaration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Given the Court will recommend dismissal of this claim with prejudice, this Court will also deny the application as moot.

II. Analysis

In screening a complaint, a court must identify cognizable claims and dismiss claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). A complaint is frivolous if it contains "claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless," such as "claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989). Dismissal for failure to state a claim under § 1915(e)(2) incorporates the standard for failure to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *Watison v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012). To survive § 1915 review, a complaint must "contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). The court liberally construes pro se complaints and may only

2728

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28